DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 083 CG 023 340

AUTHOR Lena, Hugh F.; And Others
TITLE Legal Employment at Midcareer: The Influence of Social and Academic Origins.
PUB DATE 12 Apr 91
NOTE 47p.; Contains small print which may not reproduce well. Paper presented at the Eastern Sociological Society (61st, Providence, RI, April 12-14, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; College Graduates; College Seniors; *Employment Level; Family Characteristics; Followup Studies; Higher Education; *Lawyers; National Surveys; Religious Factors; *Social Environment

ABSTRACT

This study analyzed the relative influence of individual social origins and academic achievement in organizational recruitment and practice outcomes for legal careers. It investigated the effects of background characteristics and academic performance measures for a national sample of college seniors on types of legal practices 25 years after graduation. The data for the study were derived from a 1961 national survey of over 33,000 graduating college seniors, 1,120 of whom continued post-baccalaureate studies in law and 60% of whom were listed in the 1985 edition of a national directory of practicing lawyers. Academic achievement in college and religion predicted the quality of the law school attended; in combination with occupational inheritance, these variables were found to influence allocation of lawyers to solo or firm practice. While family background characteristics were less important in determining outcomes than educational attainment, the latter explained only a small portion of the variation in legal practices. An important contextual feature structuring legal careers was the population size of the location of the practice. As the bar grows in size and diversity, it is expected that additional axes of differentiation within the profession will be located and status attainment models will have to accommodate the complex mix of individual, social, and contextual factors which structure professional careers. (51 references) (LLL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED332083

LEGAL EMPLOYMENT AT MIDCAREER
The Influence of Social and Academic Origins

Hugh F. Lena*
Providence College

Sharyn L. Roach
Flinders University of South Australia

Seymour Warkov
University of Connecticut

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Hugh F Lena

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

*Direct correspondence to Hugh F. Lena, Department of Sociology, Providence College, Providence, RI 02918

Presented at the 61st Annual Meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society, Providence, Rhode Island on April 12, 1991.

Not for reproduction, quotation, or any other use without permission of the authors.

CG023340

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LEGAL EMPLOYMENT AT MIDCAREER

The Influence of Social and Academic Origins

LEGAL EMPOLYMENT AT MIDCAREER
The Influence of Social and Academic Origins

ABSTRACT

Research on intraoccupational status attainment within the legal profession is extensive but it has not generated consistent findings on the effects of social backgrounds and academic performance in college and law school on types of legal employment. This research has been either carried out on lawyers employed in geographically circumscribed communities or has been limited to particular types of lawyers. This study investigates the effects of social backgrounds and academic achievement on types of legal employment for a national sample of lawyers a quarter of a century after their graduation from college. We find that academic achievement in college and religion predict the quality of law school attended and that in combination with occupational inheritance these variables influence the allocation of lawyers to solo and firm practice. An important contextual feature structuring legal careers is the population size of the location of practice.

Status attainment processes within the occupational hierarchy have long held interest for social scientists, particularly sociologists. An understanding of these processes helps explain the stratification system as a whole, the relative effects of ascribed and achieved criteria on social placement, and changes in occupational attainment. Since occupations are themselves distributions of status positions (Erlanger, 1980), research on intraoccupational status attainment is not only important in its own right but can inform the extent to which interoccupational status attainment is replicated within occupational groupings. The operation of these processes within professional occupations is particularly interesting since the edenic vision of the professions is one of a community of equals or social placement on the basis of meritocratic criteria alone (cf., Parsons, 1951; Goode, 1957).

Research on the legal profession has revealed inconsistent effects of social origins and academic achievement on status attainment. Some researchers note that while entry into the legal profession is correlated with characteristics of family of origin and academic performance in college, these characteristics no longer have substantial effects on the allocation of lawyers to roles and positions in their future legal practices. The decline of ascriptive influences is seen as consistent with the growth and increasing heterogeneity of the legal profession in the last half century as efforts by the profession to control the production of new lawyers have failed (Abel, 1989). Other

research documents the persisting effects of social origins, particularly ethno-religious and socioeconomic background, on status attainment among lawyers. The conversion of social advantages and disadvantages of one's birth into legal career achievement is mediated, however, by the type of law school education. Resolving this controversy over the extent of status ascription and social mobility in the professions is particularly relevant to emerging theories which focus on professional projects and jurisdictions (Abbott, 1988; Abel, 1989).

This paper analyzes the relative influence of individual social origins and achievement in organizational recruitment and practice outcomes for legal careers. We investigate the effects of background characteristics and academic performance measures for a national sample of college seniors on types of legal practices almost a quarter of a century after graduation in 1985. We find that family background and academic achievement affect career outcomes. Three limitations have qualified the conclusions from studies of legal status and the organization of lawyers' practices. First, the preponderance of research on legal careers is confined to case studies of local/regional bars or to small-scale comparative studies. We analyze a national sample of lawyers who practice throughout the country. Second, the notable exception to geographically circumscribed study populations (Erlanger, 1980) only deals with private practitioners. Our research is not limited to lawyers of a particular specialty or type of client. Finally, since our design focuses on a single cohort of college seniors through their years in law school to their practices well into their careers, it does not require that

we construct synthetic cohorts of lawyers to disentangle historical and generational effects on status attainment which bedevil cross-sectional studies (Heinz and Laumann, 1982).

SOCIAL ATTAINMENT IN THE LEGAL PROFESSION

Sociological interest in the professions, their patterns of recruitment and socialization, modes of practice, and the play of achieved and ascribed influences on their careers and social biographies has been enormous (See Abel, 1986; Wolinsky, 1988 for summaries). Early studies of the legal profession deal with segments of the bar, notably at the extremes of the prestige hierarchy. Research on solo practitioners (Carlin, 1962), Wall Street lawyers (Smigel, 1969), divorce lawyers (O'Gorman, 1963), small-town lawyers (Handler, 1967), the criminal bar (Wood, 1967) and personal injury law (Ross, 1970; Rosenthal, 1974) provide some information on status differentiation in the legal profession but generally do not permit comparative generalizations across legal specialties. Research on local or regional bars such as New York City (Carlin, 1966), Detroit (Ladinsky, 1963a,b; 1964), Toronto (Hagan et. al., 1988) or Chicago (Zemans and Rosenblum, 1981; Heinz and Laumann, 1982) give little indication of the generalizability of their findings. While some effort has been made to conduct comparative research across cities and towns in the United States (Erlanger, 1980; Landon, 1988; 1990), it has been tentative and the representativeness of the findings ambiguous.

This research demonstrates that the legal profession has a

long history of entry barriers focused on ethno-religious background, social origins, gender and race. Once admitted, Jews and Catholics, immigrants, those from working-class backgrounds, and women and minorities were underrepresented in more prestigious legal practices and specialties. However, Erlanger finds that entry into the legal profession is strongly correlated with characteristics of family of origin but it does not effect attainment within the profession. His study of private practitioners shows small correlations between aspects of social origins and achievement. He finds that the only background characteristic associated with both the quality of, and performance in, law school is religion. Lawyers from Catholic families are less likely to attend high quality law schools than those with Protestant or Jewish backgrounds, but as compared to Protestants, Catholic and Jewish lawyers report higher law school grades. Yet, the variance explained in reported class standing by background characteristics remains minimal. While Erlanger concludes that social background variables have small effects on the practice outcomes of firm size and type of client, achievement characteristics of reputed quality of law school and reported class standing significantly affected these practice outcomes.

Earlier city studies by Ladinsky and Carlin find relationships between both religion and father's entrepreneurial status and firm size. Erlanger is unable to replicate these findings. However, he confirmed the strength of the effects on educational variables in their research. While Erlanger believes the correlates of status attainment in the legal profession do not

appear to change over time, he speculates that background variables may emerge as better predictors of status as city size increases and further that the processes of status attainment are different in smaller communities (cf. Handler, 1967) than in larger cities (Smigel, 1969). Greater homogeneity in both social backgrounds and practice settings of smaller communities may suppress the effect of ascriptive influences, while, contrary to Parsons' (1951) formulation, ascription is a stronger allocation mechanism in the more differentiated larger cities (cf., Landon, 1988). Heinz and Laumann (1982) investigate the social biographies of individuals with different social attributes -- social origins, law school, previous jobs -- in the Chicago Bar. The numbers of women and Blacks were too small to permit analysis, but they find ethno-religious group origin and father's occupation to be of central importance in explaining type of school attended. Subsequently, type of law school was critical for first job placement and subsequent career. Heinz and Laumann claim the real variance explained by social origins in Erlanger's study is concealed by his use of broad ethno-religious categories which are internally heterogeneous (1982: 172). Heinz and Laumann's research supports the proposition that social status is transmitted inter-generationally; the effects of social origins are mediated by type of law school attended. They caution, however, that "the impact of social origins on subsequent career development should not be exaggerated ... only a small portion of the total variance in career achievement is attributable to such factors" (Heinz and Laumann, 1982: 173).

While Erlanger attributes these discrepant findings to geographical variation in status attainment processes, Heinz and Laumann suggest the differences stem from specification of the population universes and operationalization of key variables (1982:171). The present study addresses these questions from a unique perspective. It reports on the relative influence of social origins, particularly ethno-religious backgrounds, and achievement in college and law school on the types of legal practices by city size for a single cohort of lawyers. Our data are not limited to a particular type of legal practice or the urban bar and thus enabling an examination of the effects of social origins and academic achievement on legal employment of lawyers at midcareer.

SAMPLE AND PROCEDURES

The data for this study derive from a random sample of 1961 aspirants to law school and from a national directory of practicing lawyers. The lawyers in our study: (1) graduated from college in 1961; (2) declared an interest in pursuing a career in the field of law as college seniors; (3) continued their post-baccalaureate studies in law during the year following college graduation; and (4) were listed in the 1985 Martindale-Hubbell Directory of lawyers.

THE ORIGINAL SURVEY

In Spring, 1961, the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) conducted a major survey of the career plans and aspirations of 33,782 graduating seniors at 135 American colleges and

universities (Davis 1964). Of these seniors 1697 aspired to a career in law, and one year later a follow-up of the entire sample produced a response rate of 92.8 percent of legal aspirants.[1] An analysis of these prospective lawyers showed links between the career choice of law and various social attributes suggesting that substantial social, academic, and personal selection of prospective lawyers had taken place by the time the bachelor's degree was in hand. These same social factors predicted commencement of legal studies one year later as well as placement within the highly stratified system of professional education (Warkov with Zelan, 1965). NORC contacted the study population again in spring 1963 to ascertain academic and employment status and it administered a lengthy questionnaire in spring 1964 with 71.8 percent of the cohort cooperating with this fourth wave. Earlier research on this cohort did not investigate the ethnic factor although these data were collected. Due to the small number of minority respondents, the cohort is virtually all white males.

This study traces the effects of social origins and academic achievement on the legal practices for a national sample of lawyers in all types of practice who graduated from college in the same year. Second, this cohort coincides with the maturation of people born during World War II who entered law school just prior to the explosive growth and increased diversity of the profession. We cannot easily determine how status attainment processes in a single cohort differs from those in other cohorts or for the legal profession as a whole. Curran (1986) reports

that after a five-year period of stable admissions to the bar ending in 1964, just as most of our cohort was entering practice, the number of first admissions to the bar grew significantly. While our sample was limited to males, this reflects the composition of new entrants to the legal profession at the time. Curran further reports that over 97% of first admissions to the bar during the decade of the 1960s were male (1986:25). Thus, our sample is not representative of the bar in 1985 due to the substantial growth in the numbers of lawyers, particularly women and minorities over the past twenty years (Abel, 1989).

THE FOLLOW-UP DATA

We were able to identify over six in ten members of the 1961 sample who were engaged in legal practice twenty-four years after college graduation in the Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory.[2] Two items of information in the Directory are of critical importance for our analysis of status attainment: type of practice and size of firm. The Directory listings provide information on the employer's name or title or the lawyer's address from which we classified the different types of practice. Where only an address was given we coded type of practice as 'solo', the listing of two or more partners was coded as 'firm', and the coding of corporate, government, law school, judicial and other, such as legal aid, practice was self-evident.[3] The "Biographical Section' of the Directory provides the names of all lawyers in each firm listed, including the main office and any branch offices both within the United States and overseas. We measured size by the number of lawyers in a particular firm and recorded

the size of the lawyer's office, and its status as a main or branch office. On balance, size of firm is a more critical indicator of the organization of lawyer's employment location than is office size.[4] Following Heinz and Laumann we classified firm size as follows: "small" firm - under ten lawyers; "medium" sized firm - ten to twenty-nine lawyers; and "large" firm - thirty or more lawyers.

The use of directories to follow the careers of professionals is not without limitations (cf., Warkov and Roach, 1987). Most notably, the quality of some data can be questioned. There is no information on first job obtained. Moreover, there is a self-selection bias with a Martindale-Hubbell listing: information is lacking on the 1984 status of unlisted 1961 law school entrants. Nevertheless, data contained therein can provide useful answers to questions that remain from cross-sectional research on status attainment while minimizing further problems of nonparticipation by respondents to another follow-up questionnaire. The Martindale-Hubbell Directory has provided data for many of the previously mentioned studies of lawyers and the legal profession (see for example, Smigel, 1964; Epstein, 1981; Slovak, 1979; Erlanger, 1980; Heinz and Laumann, 1982; Curran, 1985). Cohort members are more likely to be listed in the Directory a quarter of a century after their graduation if they had a parent-lawyer, if they performed better academically in college and if they attended a higher quality law school. A measure of ethno-religious origins has no bearing on the likelihood of a 1985 Directory listing (Warkov and Roach, 1987).

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Sample 'mortality' during the twenty-four years encompassed by this study was remarkably small given the research design. Of the original sample of 1697 college seniors who aspired to a career in law following their 1961 graduation, 1120 had initiated legal study a year later, 92.8 percent of whom responded to the 1961 questionnaire and slightly more than 60 percent of the 1961 graduates were identified in the 1985 Martindale-Hubbell Directory.[5] Aside from social class origins, academic performance and quality of law school attended, the listed lawyers differ from individuals in their cohort who were not listed in minor ways (see Table 1).

THE LEGAL COHORT

Subsequent analyses are confined to members of the cohort who are listed in 1985 ("surviving lawyers"). The portrait of their social and academic origins some twenty years into their legal careers, is not surprising. One fifth of these lawyers had at least one parent who was a lawyer and two out of three were recruited from upper-middle or higher socioeconomic origins as indexed by occupation (Warkov and Roach, 1987). Catholics comprise almost one third of the surviving sample, Jews over one-quarter, and Protestants almost forty percent of the lawyers identified in 1985. Most Protestants describe their national origins as Northwestern European, about a tenth are Irish Catholic, another tenth are Northwestern European Catholic; and for the balance, "Catholic-other", primarily indicates a

Southern or Eastern European background.[6]

Surviving lawyers are particularly likely to have performed well academically in college and are less likely to have attended a non-prestigious law school. The academic performance index (API) is based on graduating seniors' reported cumulative grade point average corrected for variation among schools in measured ability of their students (Davis, 1964: 26-31). Almost one in every two practicing lawyers in our study graduated from an "elite" or "prestige" law school. Following earlier studies which ranked American law schools (Blau and Margulies, 1975; Cartter, 1977), six law schools are designated as "elite" (Harvard, Yale, Michigan, Columbia, Chicago, and Stanford), and another ten are labelled "prestige" (University of California, Berkeley, New York University, Pennsylvania, Virginia, UCLA, Cornell, University of Texas, Duke, Northwestern, and Georgetown. The remaining law schools are called, "other". One half of all students scoring high on API attended the top six law schools and another one in four entered "prestige" schools. In brief, a tight link exists between undergraduate academic achievement and quality of law school attended as has been repeatedly demonstrated in studies of the legal profession.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The distribution of surviving lawyers' legal practices is given in Table 2. Less than one-third of this cohort of lawyers is engaged in solo practice, about one-in-four is in a law firm of any size, almost 17% practice in corporations and less than six percent work in the government sector.[7] One third of our sample

practices in the northeast and more than one third practice in our nation's smallest cities and towns, comparable to the geographic distribution of lawyers in 1980 (Halliday, 1986) but more urbanized than the national bar (Abel, 1989).

THE ROLE OF ASCRIPTION AND ACHIEVEMENT IN LEGAL CAREERS

One robust finding of interoccupational and intra-occupational studies is the indirect influence of background variables through education on career outcomes. While industrialization and urbanization may promote a drift toward equal opportunity and a shift from ascription to achievement in role assignment, ascriptive influences over careers should persist (Meyhew, 1968; Wilensky and Lawrence, 1979). Ascriptive influences remain "efficient" allocation criteria in the face of pressures toward performance-oriented criteria. They are efficient mechanisms for controlling the market for legal services especially when the legal profession has lost some control over the production of new lawyers and it strives to control the productions of services by new lawyers (Abel, 1985). Laummann (1973), sees no functional incompatibility between the contradictory strains of achievement and ascription in status allocation, particularly when they may be embraced to different extents depending on social class location. Among middle- and upper-class lawyers, however, do achievement criteria supersede characteristics such as ethno-religious origins as a salient and distinctive basis for career outcomes?

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

A host of legal studies testify to the underrepresentation of Catholic and Jewish lawyers in the higher status firm practices and an overrepresentation of protestant lawyers in firm practice. Our data confirm the persistent effects of ascription. We find that Catholic lawyers are less likely to score high on our measure of academic achievement and are significantly less likely to attend an elite law school than either Protestant or Jewish lawyers (see Table 3). While our findings on academic performance are opposite to those of Erlanger, our measurements differ. Erlanger operationalized academic performance in terms of self-reported law school grades in the first year while our measure of academic performance is based on undergraduate grade point average corrected for variation among schools in the quality of their students. Religious affiliation has a stronger effect on undergraduate academic performance than on law school performance. However, we also find that Jewish lawyers are more likely than either Protestants or Catholics to have performed well academically and to have gained acceptance to an elite law school. Our data indicate that while religion is associated with achievement, family status and ethnicity have small and non-significant effects on the type of law school attended by different religious groups. These variables account for only two percent of the variance in law school quality for Protestants, four percent for Jews and six percent for Catholics (table not shown). Family status as measured by household head's occupational status is related (but not causally) to law school quality. Approximately three in ten sons of lawyers attended the

top six law schools as compared to slightly over one in ten respondents with professional/managerial (non-lawyer) parents. Similar proportions of each social status attended the "prestige" schools. The inclusion of academic performance as an explanatory variable in the model with law school quality as the dependent variable increases the percentage of explained variation to 24% for Protestants (stb = .479; p = .0001) and to 25% for Catholics (stb = .464;p = .0001) and to 24% for Jews (stb. = .47; p = .0001) (cf., Table 4).

TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

In sum, these comparisons convey the overriding importance of college level academic performance in determining the fate of aspiring law students. The status attainment model therefore can be elaborated as follows: most effects of social and ethno-religious origins are mediated through their impact on API and, in turn, this measure of academic performance directly determined access to elite, prestige, and other law schools. These findings conform with with Heinz and Laumann's (1982) conclusions.

TWO DECADES LATER: BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS AND ACHIEVEMENT

The legal profession has undergone a remarkable social transformation in the last quarter century (Abel, 1986; Curran, 1986). The number of lawyers more than doubled, population to lawyer ratios almost halved and large numbers of women and minorities were admitted to the bar (Curran, 1986: 20). While the median age of the legal profession dropped and the percentage

of less experienced lawyers grew, the profile of legal practices began to change. The solo practitioner no longer dominated the profession, and the large firms on the other end of the private practice spectrum, continued to grow in frequency and size. Concurrently, there was an expansion of opportunities in government and private industry for lawyers and increased popularity of corporate counsel. An examination of the role of social origins and achievement in status attainment in the context of this transformation is timely.

Table 5 shows type of legal practice by religion, occupational inheritance and achievement variables. The practice variable has been coded so that the distributions in this sample of lawyers may be compared to previous studies of status attainment. This allows us to examine the contradictory findings on the role of religious affiliation for a national sample of lawyers of all types.

TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

The percentages for religious affiliation have been calculated for type of practice and religion. It is customary to calculate percentages within categories of the independent variable but most of the previous studies of ascriptive influences on status attainment report percentages within types of practice. In Table 5, the percentages for types of practice across religious groups comparable to studies of local bars as well as Erlanger's national data are provided in brackets.

Most research on career outcomes for lawyers suggests that religion continues to operate as a sorting mechanism into type of

practice. Jewish and Catholic lawyers are underrepresented in firms, especially large elite firm practice, while disproportionate percentages of Protestant lawyers find their way into legal firms. These studies thus find Catholic and Jewish lawyers are more likely to be solo practitioners. In contrast, Erlanger sees only a minor role for religion in determining practice characteristics. The earlier studies of local bars by Ladinsky, Carlin and others suggest that anywhere from a third to over three-quarters of solo practitioners were Jewish and less than one-quarter of large firm practitioners were Jewish. Erlanger finds that only 22% of solo practitioners were Jewish and that there is little variation across different sized firms for Jews.

TYPES OF LEGAL PRACTICE

In the current study, which encompasses a national sample and lawyers who are not in private practice, some variation exists between religion and type of practice. Among solo practitioners, the percentages vary little by religion but among lawyers in firms of all sizes, almost half are Protestant whereas roughly a quarter are Jewish and another quarter are Catholic (in brackets). When percentages are calculated in the customary manner, a slightly different pattern emerges. Jewish lawyers are more likely to be solo practitioners than are Protestants, but there is little variation by religion across firms of various sizes. The concentration of Catholic lawyers in solo and other non-firm types of practice and the slight overrepresentation of Jewish lawyers, relative to Protestants, in solo and small-firm

practice in this study are consistent with the recent findings on Toronto lawyers by Hagan and his colleagues (1988: 36-7) and with other, earlier, studies of local bars in Chicago (Heinz and Laumann, 1982), Detroit (Ladinsky, 1963), and New York (Carlin, 1962).

TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

Among firm lawyers, religious affiliation is only modestly related to size of firm, another frequently employed indicator of status attainment. In this study, while Protestants are more likely than either Jews or Catholics to be in firms, they are slightly more likely to be in smaller firms whereas Jewish and Catholic lawyers are spread evenly among different-sized firms. Table 6 also shows that occupational inheritance has a bearing on type of practice. Those lawyers who came from families with a lawyer are more likely to practice in small and large firms than in either medium-sized firms or solo practice. These data do not permit an interpretation of the non-linear effects of occupational inheritance on legal status, but it may be that occupational inheritance encourages high status attainment in a large firm as well as joining a small family practice. The association between academic achievement, both as an undergraduate and in terms of the quality of law school attended, is less ambiguous. Higher academic achievement on both counts results in higher legal status (if that is to be gauged by firm size), especially for Protestants and lower academic performance and attendance at a non-prestigious law school are associated with solo practice (see Appendix). These results are consistent

with earlier studies of status attainment.

TYPE OF PRACTICE BY ORIGINS AND ATTAINMENT

Type of practice is associated with social origins. Lawyers with a parent-lawyer are more likely to work in a firm (STB = .21 p = .000 for all religious groups). Occupational inheritance directly effects firm employment for each of the three major religious groups, but especially for Protestants (Table 6). Undergraduate academic performance predicts firm employment for Catholics, but not for Protestants or Jews. The quality of law school significantly predicts firm employment for Jewish lawyers. While the sizes of these effects are modest, they do reveal persistent ascriptive influences on one feature of status attainment in the legal profession. Conversely, academic performance predicts under-representation of Catholic and Protestant lawyers, but not among Jewish lawyers in solo practice, for whom, law school quality is negatively associated with solo practice.

We also compare employment profiles by the size of community in which these lawyers practice. The largest cities consist of six locations with populations of 1,000,000 or more -- New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Houston, Detroit, plus Dallas which had slightly less than one million inhabitants in 1980. About twenty-three percent of the lawyers in this study list addresses in these cities. Another 40 percent are distributed among cities ranging from San Diego (population -875,538) to cities reaching the 100,000 level. The remainder (another 36 percent) are listed as the smallest cities (under 100,000) and

towns. The professional practice profile for the total sample masks substantial variation that is a function of community size. This variable is negatively related to solo practice for Protestants and especially Catholics, but not for Jewish lawyers (see Table 7). While these findings combined with the data in Table 5 support the classic generalization that solo practice provides a port of entry to the profession for minority group members since firm and solo practices can be explained by social, religious and educational variables, the model has little explanatory power. The R-Squares remain quite small.

Social origins and academic achievement are somewhat better predictors of firm size. The adjusted R-Squares for Protestants is .24, for Catholics .23, and for Jews .08. City size is directly associated with firm size for Protestants and Catholics, but not for Jewish lawyers. For the latter, academic performance positively predicts firm size while quality of law school is negatively associated with firm size (STB = .405 and -.069 respectively -- Table not shown). The influence of city size on size of firm (STB = .423 for Protestants and STB =.477 for Catholics) suggests that the context of practice is a critical factor in both type of practice and firm size.

VARIATION ACROSS CITIES

The effect of community context on the nature of legal practice and career contingencies of professionals has been the focus of attention in prior research (Erlanger, 1980; Landon, 1988). Over half of our sample of solo practitioners work in

small communities while 18 percent are located in the largest metropolitan areas (see Table 5). Conversely, only about eight percent of lawyers in large firms are located in small towns and cities and over half of large firm lawyers practice in medium sized communities and another four in ten lawyers are in major urban centers. Thus, there is a clear relationship between community size and type of legal practice. Close inspection of variation by location in other types of legal practice shows that employment in corporations in the private sector is also related to community size (data not shown). The size-related pattern of government employment (nine percent of these lawyers are in medium-sized communities) is in part attributable to the "Washington, D.C. effect" since half of the government lawyers list a Washington, D.C. address. Overall, these findings are consistent with the literature concerning the societal division of labor and the concentration of certain political, administrative and technical functions in urban centers. Of greater concern here is the clear relationship between city size and solo and firm practice. These results are also consistent with the findings of Landon on the likelihood of specific types of practice in three midwest settings.

TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

Our 1985 data confirm the relationship between context and the likelihood of different types of practice. Over half of the small city lawyers in our study practice solo or in small firms and almost six in ten of medium and large city lawyers practice in medium to large sized firms. Moreover, there is a significant

relationship between size of firm and city size (r = .346 in Table 4). Thus, we concur with Landon that context of practice is an additional differentiating feature of legal careers which is worth of further study.

Do ascription and achievement operate in status attainment in consistent ways across the spectrum of community contexts in which American lawyers practice? To answer that question we next turn to social origins and academic achievement in determining types of practice in diverse ecological settings. Table 7 reports the effects of ascriptive and achievement variables on solo and firm practice respectively. The data reveal that the effects of these variables are conditioned by the ecological setting of practice. For instance, religion predicts solo practice only for Protestants and Jews, but not for Catholic lawyers: the effect of Protestant religion is negatively related to solo practice only in smaller and medium-sized communities, while for Jewish lawyers in our sample, the positive effect can be found in cities of all three types. Moreover, occupational inheritance is negatively related to solo practice when Catholic and Jewish are in the equation, but not when Protestant is a predictor. Academic performance continues to exert a significant negative effect on solo practice for all three equations. Although the size of these effects is modest, these data show in small and medium-size cities that religion, social origins and academic achievement in a lawyer's undergraduate training are related to solo practice to different degrees. In predicting solo practice in the largest of

our Nation's cities, all effects disappear, with the exception of being Jewish. Larger urban centers, then, seem to foster greater reliance on meritocratic criteria for recruitment into solo practice.

Table 7 shows the effects of ascriptive and achievement variables on firm employment. Remarkably, only occupational inheritance is related to this type of practice. Lawyers who come from families where one parent is a lawyer are more likely to practice in a firm twenty-four years after their graduation from college. This conclusion is consistent with the interpretation that city size has an effect on firm employment as noted earlier and that when the effects of community size are controlled, ascriptive and achievement characteristics are not significant sorting mechanisms for status attainment among lawyers. The results of Table 7 confirm the earlier findings of Erlanger (1980) and Landon (1988) that correlates of status attainment do vary by city size. This instance of confirmation, however, is based on a national sample of lawyers practicing in a large number of town and cities throughout the country rather than a comparison of a small number of cities in different studies with different sampling procedures and diverse ways of categorizing types of practice as in these previous studies.

As for the other major indicator of status attainment -- firm size -- our results differ only slightly from those of Erlanger. While he finds only occupation of head of household to predict firm size, we find both occupational inheritance and undergraduate academic performance significantly related to firm size in medium sized communities. Occupational inheritance is

negatively related to firm size and undergraduate academic achievement is positively related to firm size in these communities (tables not shown). No such effects were found in small towns and cities or in the largest American cities.

CONCLUSIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS

Overall, the findings further attest to the relevance of both ascriptive and achievement criteria for locating 1961 college graduates who continue their legal studies immediately after graduation and who are practicing lawyers a quarter of a century later. Note, however, that the substantive significance of these status indicators should not be misread for their predictive value is very modest -- a qualification reflected in previous empirical studies of status attainment in the legal profession. The results indicate the persistent effects of ascription on the legal practices a quarter of a century after lawyers graduation from college. Though our data are confined to white males, we still find that minority group status has an adverse effect on attaining high status positions in large law firms well into lawyers careers. Jewish lawyers are still concentrated in solo practice, Catholics in solo and non-private practice settings. Occupational inheritance, as indexed by whether there was a lawyer-parent in the family, continues to influence the trajectories of lawyers careers. Children of lawyers are more likely to be located in firm practice than solo practice, although not necessarily in the nation's largest firms or urban bars. Moreover, measures of achievement both in these lawyers' undergraduate training and in the quality of law school attended

foster greater status attainment in the legal profession.

The results attest to the important role that community context plays in structuring legal careers. The likelihood of firm employment, and firm size, varies directly with the size of the city in which these lawyers practice. To be sure, opportunities for employment in corporations and practice in firms (especially larger firms) are concentrated in larger cities and metropolitan centers. Following Lortie (1960), Landon describes two types of legal practice -- institutional and entrepreneurial. Institutional careers are associated with large law firms where neophytes start as employee-apprentices, have little individual autonomy at first, and have no clients of their own. The entrepreneurial career, characteristic of solo practice or of loose affiliation with a few other practitioners, involves more autonomy from senior colleagues, but greater dependence on one's own clients for economic viability and professional development. Institutional careers, dependent as they are on corporate development and urbanization which increases the complexity of client needs and subsequent legal specialization, are linked to firm employment in metropolitan areas. Entrepreneurial careers are characteristic of solo or small firm practice in both rural and large metropolitan areas. While Landon argues that a rural entrepreneurial career is qualitatively different from its metropolitan counterpart in that it is the norm for practice and enjoys greater prestige in professional circles, the frequency of solo practice in rural and metropolitan settings is roughly the same when the contents of practice are the same. Overall, though

he sees a clear monotonic relationship between institutional careers and community size. It is likely that appropriate sociocultural measures of clientele served by cohort members would enhance the predictive power of the model (cf., Heinz and Laumann, 1982).

Sociologists have noted that the impersonality of the urban center enhances economic competition and correspondingly dilutes the influence of traditional criteria in shaping careers. On the contrary, our findings imply that occupational inheritance, and by extension, family advantage is critical for locating lawyers in the legal labor market.

The legal profession has undergone a dramatic transformation in the past two decades. Significant changes include the emergence of the large law firm, the influx in large number of women and to a lesser extent other minorities, the expansion of job opportunities in government and business, the development of para-legal support staff, and the increasing number and variety of laws and government regulations. A full explanation of stratification and status attainment within the legal profession requires investigation of such structural changes.

A return to the 1961 NORC survey of graduating seniors supports a status attainment model of stratification for the legal profession to the extent that socioeconomic and religo-ethnic origins affect career aspirations, commitments and outcomes. However, their effects are mostly mediated through academic performance at the undergraduate level (Davis, 1964): the latter factor directly determines the quality of law school attended which, in turn, is likely to affect the first and

subsequent jobs a law school graduate obtains. Studies of the metropolitan bar, such as Chicago, and the present paper offer complementary portraits of achievement and ascriptive factors shaping the legal profession. In contrast to Parsons' early formulation (1951), Laumann (1968) suggests that contradictory strains toward achievement and ascription are not inherently functionally incompatible. They are able to co-exist in modern society and have varying degrees of relevance for different occupations and labor force participants.

Findings on this national cohort of lawyers suggest a loose coupling of background characteristics, occupational inheritance and academic origins in predicting professional outcomes over twenty years into lawyers careers. While family background characteristics are less important in determining outcomes than educational attainment, the latter only explain a small portion of the variation in legal practices. An important contextual feature structuring legal careers, however, is the population size of the location of practice. This study complements, and extends, the suggestive findings of Erlanger and Landon on the important role that location plays in differentiating the legal profession. As the bar grows in size and diversity, it is expected that additional axes of differentiation within the profession will be located and status attainment models will have to accommodate the complex mix of individual, social and contextual factors which structure professional careers.

TABLE 1 COMPARISON OF 'SURVIVORS' AND 'NON-SURVIVORS' IN 1985 FROM THE 1961 COHORT OF ASPIRING LAWYERS (in percent)

	Survivors	Non-Survivors
SOCIAL ORIGINS[a]		
Parent-lawyer	20.3% (153)	14.7% (50)
Parent-other	79.7% (601)	85.3% (291)
Religious Background		
Protestant	39.3% (276)	37.1% (117)
Catholic	29.8% (210)	34.6% (109)
Jewish	27.7% (195)	25.1% (79)
Other, None	3.3% (23)	3.2% (10)
Religioethnic Origins		
NW European Protestant	33.1% (233)	30.5% (96)
Irish Catholic	10.4% (73)	12.4% (39)
Central/East Europ. Jew	18.3% (129)	20.0% (63)
All Other	38.3% (269)	37.1% (117)
Academic Performance Index (API)[b]		
High	35.0% (249)	25.0% (80)
Medium	39.5% (281)	36.6% (117)
Bottom Half	25.6% (182)	38.4% (123)
Law School Quality[b]		
Elite	24.8% (191)	14.7% (51)
Prestige	22.2% (171)	21.9% (76)
Other	53.0% (409)	63.4% (220)

Note:
[a] Chi Square significant @ .05
[b] Chi Square significant @ .01

TABLE 2 DISTRIBUTION OF CHARACTERISTICS OF LEGAL PRACTICES FOR MARTINDALE-HUBBELL LAWYERS IN 1985

	PERCENT	N
Legal Rating		
Very High	59.2	251
Not Very High	40.9	173
Type of Legal Practice		
Solo	27.5	173
Small Firm (2-9 lawyers)	16.3	103
Med. Firm (10-29 lawyers)	11.3	71
Large Firm (30+ lawyers)	14.1	89
Corporation	17.8	112
Government	5.6	35
Judiciary	3.2	20
Other (Legal Serv., teaching, etc)	4.3	27
Firm Size		
Small Firm	39.2	103
Medium Sized Firm	27.0	71
Large Firm	33.8	89
Region		
Northeast	33.0	244
Midwest	24.5	181
South	23.0	170
West	19.6	145
City Size		
Smallest Cities and Towns	36.7	270
Medium-Size Cities	40.4	297
Largest Seven Cities	22.9	168
Type Of Client		
Solo	23.2	173
Firm	50.2	374
Corporate	15.2	113
Other	11.4	85

TABLE 3 RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION BY SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF LEGAL PRACTICES IN 1985 (in percent)

	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish
Social Origins			
Lawyer Parent	19.9 (54)	22.4 (46)	21.0 (40)
Achievement			
High Academic Perform.	37.4 (102)	23.6 (49)	42.3 (82)
Elite Law School	26.8 (74)	13.8 (29)	32.3 (63)
Practice			
High Legal Rating	58.8 (100)	51.8 (59)	65.6 (61)
Type of Practice			
Solo	18.4 (49)	23.6 (47)	28.4 (53)
Small Firm	16.8 (45)	11.0 (22)	12.3 (23)
Medium Firm	10.5 (28)	9.6 (19)	9.6 (18)
Large Firm	13.5 (36)	9.6 (19)	12.8 (24)
All Other	40.8 (109)	46.2 (92)	36.9 (69)
Firm Size			
Small	41.8 (46)	38.1 (24)	35.4 (23)
Medium	25.5 (28)	31.8 (20)	27.7 (18)
Large	32.7 (36)	30.1 (19)	36.9 (24)
City Size			
Smallest	41.2 (108)	38.1 (75)	29.4 (55)
Medium-Size	42.4 (111)	42.6 (84)	34.8 (65)
Largest Seven Cities	16.4 (43)	19.3 (38)	35.8 (67)

TABLE 4 REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF QUALITY OF LAW SCHOOL ON SOCIAL, RELIGIOUS AND ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS AND ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

VARIABLE	STB	STD ERROR	P	R SQUARE
LAWYER-PARENT	.064	.071	.061	
NORTHWEST EUROPEAN	-.056	.069	.145	
PROTESTANT	-.021	.065	.589	
API	.479	.037	.0001*	
INTERCEPT	0	.066		
				.239
LAWYER-PARENT	.068	.071	.047*	
NORTHWEST EUROPEAN	-.044	.061	.196	
CATHOLIC	-.082	.063	.018*	
API	.464	.038	.0001*	
INTERCEPT	0	.067		
				.246
LAWYER-PARENT	.060	.071	.078	
NORTHWEST EUROPEAN	-.014	.072	.736	
JEWISH	.061	.076	.130	
API	.476	.037	.0001*	
INTERCEPT	0	.078		
				.242

* Significant

TABLE 5 TYPE OF PRACTICE BY SOCIAL ORIGINS AND ACHIEVEMENT 1985 (in percent)*

	FIRM					
	SOLO	SMALL	MEDIUM	LARGE	OTHER	TOTAL
RELIGION						
Protestant	18.4	16.8	10.5	13.5	40.8	100% (267)
	[31.6]	[48.4]	[42.4]	[43.9]	[38.9]	
Catholic	23.6	11.0	9.6	9.6	46.2	100% (199)
	[30.3]	[23.7]	[28.8]	[23.2]	[32.9]	
Jewish	28.4	12.3	9.6	12.8	36.9	100% (187)
	[34.2]	[24.7]	[27.3]	[29.3]	[24.6]	
Other, None	26.1	13.0	4.3	13.0	43.6	100% (23)
	[3.9]	[3.2]	[1.5]	[3.6]	[3.6]	
	[100%]	[100%]	[100%]	[100%]	[100%]	
LAWYER-PARENT	14.3	21.1	13.6	18.4	32.6	
	(21)	(31)	(20)	(27)	(48)	
HIGH ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	15.0	15.0	8.9	21.5	39.4	
	(37)	(37)	(22)	(53)	(97)	
HIGH LEGAL RATING	7.2	24.9	16.9	29.3	21.7	
	(18)	(62)	(42)	(73)	(54)	
CITY SIZE						
Smallest	32.8	17.5	6.0	2.6	41.0	100% (268)
	[54.3]	[47.0]	[22.9]	[8.1]	[35.7]	
Medium-Size	16.6	11.8	12.2	15.2	44.3	100% (296)
	[29.2]	[35.0]	[51.4]	[52.3]	[42.5]	
Largest Seven	18.5	10.7	10.7	20.2	39.9	100% (168)
	[18.4]	[18.0]	[25.7]	[39.5]	[21.8]	
	[100%]	[100%]	[100%]	[100%]	[100%]	

* Bracketed percentages calculated within types of legal practice are provided for comparability to previous studies.

TABLE 6 REGRESSION ANALYSES OF SOLO AND FIRM PRACTICE ON SOCIAL EDUCATIONAL AND CONTEXTUAL CHARACTERISTICS OF LAWYERS

VARIABLE	STB	STD ERROR	P	R SQUARE
SOLO PRACTICE				
PROTESTANT				
LAWYER-PARENT	-.136	.067	.039*	
API	-.167	.039	.024*	
LAW SCHOOL QUALITY	.017	.034	.821	
CITY SIZE	-.159	.036	.017*	
INTERCEPT	0	.074		
				.089
CATHOLIC				
LAWYER-PARENT	-.020	.089	.790	
API	-.190	.049	.019*	
LAW SCHOOL QUALITY	-.057	.051	.486	
CITY SIZE	-.245	.048	.002*	
INTERCEPT	0	.096		
				.124
JEWISH				
LAWYER-PARENT	-.068	.098	.417	
API	-.030	.062	.759	
LAW SCHOOL QUALITY	-.242	.056	.020*	
CITY SIZE	-.045	.048	.073	
INTERCEPT	0	.126		
				.105
FIRM PRACTICE				
PROTESTANT				
LAWYER-PARENT	.281	.077	.000*	
API	.074	.046	.287	
LAW SCHOOL QUALITY	.049	.041	.477	
CITY SIZE	.019	.042	.762	
INTERCEPT	0	.088		
				.102
CATHOLIC				
LAWYER-PARENT	.195	.085	.006*	
API	.161	.049	.033*	
LAW SCHOOL QUALITY	.093	.051	.217	
CITY SIZE	.044	.049	.543	
INTERCEPT	0	.098		
				.095
JEWISH				
LAWYER-PARENT	.151	.089	.041*	
API	.040	.059	.653	
LAW SCHOOL QUALITY	.184	.052	.043*	
CITY SIZE	.220	.044	.002*	
INTERCEPT	0	.115		
				.129

* Significant

TABLE 7 REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF SOLO AND FIRM PRACTICE ON RELIGION, OCCUPATIONAL INHERITANCE AND ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT BY CITY SIZE 1985

SOLO PRACTICE

VARIABLE	SMALL CITY STD	B	SE	MEDIUM CITY STD	B	SE	LARGE CITY STD	B	SE
Protestant	-.139*	-.137	.069	-.158*	-.127	.053	-.091	-.078	.079
Lawyer-Parent	-.103	-.128	.095	-.119	-.110	.060	-.036	-.039	.101
API	-.139	-.083	.048	-.169*	-.088	.039	.128	.015	.058
Law Sch. Qual.	-.108	-.066	.047	-.064	-.029	.035	-.133	-.064	.051
Adj. R-Square			.061			.076			.000
Catholic	.013	.014	.076	-.040	-.012	.060	-.167	-.155	.084
Lawyer-Parent	-.081	-.108	.095	-.133*	-.124	.061	-.001	-.001	.100
API	-.140*	-.087	.049	-.194*	-.101	.040	-.006	-.003	.057
Law Sch. Qual.	-.117	-.071	.048	-.044	-.020	.035	-.168	-.081	.050
Adj. R-Square			.042			.051			.018
Jewish	.161*	.191	.084	.161*	.151	.062	.210*	.169	.071
Lawyer-Parent	-.103	-.138	.094	-.125*	-.116	.060	-.026	-.028	.098
API	-.159*	-.099	.048	-.205*	-.107	.039	.019	.010	.056
Law Sch. Qual.	-.126	-.077	.047	-.073	-.034	.035	-.130	-.062	.050
Adj. R-Square			.067			.076			.036

FIRM PRACTICE

VARIABLE	SMALL CITY STD	B	SE	MEDIUM CITY STD	B	SE	LARGE CITY STD	B	SE
Protestant	.089	.089	.064	.066	.067	.060	-.096	-.105	.089
Lawyer-Parent	.198*	.264	.086	.236*	.268	.068	.179*	.229	.106
API	.103	.067	.046	.104	.067	.044	.053	.036	.064
Law Sch. Qual.	.113	.071	.044	.083	.049	.041	.109	.064	.057
Adj. R-Square			.073			.083			.043
Catholic	.025	.026	.070	.009	.010	.066	-.051	-.060	.092
Lawyer-Parent	.183*	.244	.085	.240*	.273	.068	.193*	.246	.106
API	.112	.076	.046	.112	.072	.045	.045	.030	.064
Law Sch. Qual.	.121	.076	.045	.078	.046	.041	.088	.052	.056
Adj. R-Square			.066			.079			.037
Jewish	-.119	-.141	.075	-.046	-.054	.072	.112	.112	.081
Lawyer-Parent	.200*	.266	.085	.237*	.269	.068	.186*	.237	.105
API	.118	.077	.045	.114	.073	.044	.052	.035	.064
Law Sch. Qual.	.122	.077	.044	.085	.050	.041	.105	.062	.056
Adj. R-Square			.079			.081			.047

* Significant

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FOOTNOTES

1. Note that while 1697 graduating seniors were legal aspirants, 1120 continued their post-baccalaureate studies in the field of law after graduation from college. A further aspect of this analysis is the virtual absence of women. The reason for this is that in the initial (1961) NORC study only two percent of the respondent group was female. Because their sparse number does not permit meaningful analysis they were omitted from this study.

2. The Martindale-Hubbell Law Directory is complied annually and lists lawyers in the United States, U.S. Territories, and American and foreign lawyers working in American firms in other countries. The Directory provides an alphabetical listing of individual lawyers by town and state of practice, and government lawyers in Washington, D.C. by agency, commission, and department of practice. Year of birth, first admission to the bar, undergraduate degree and college attended, law degree and law school, a professional rating of legal ability, and information on type of practice. A second section of the Directory provides additional information on solo practitioners and lawyers in firms.

3. Hagan and his colleagues note the difficulties, particularly for solo and small firm practitioners, of distinguishing type of practice in terms of numbers of lawyers (1988) and Landon (1988) documents contextual variation within solo (or entrepreneurial) practices. For comparability, we employed the standard definition of types of practice.

4. Firm size is a more critical indicator of organization than

is office size, but reporting of the latter variable in the Martindale-Hubbell Directory is more complete. Information in the Directory may indicate that a law firm has many branch offices, some overseas, yet not every lawyer employed in every office is necessarily listed. However, in every case where an office was listed in the 'Biographical Section' information on size was available as well. Firm size is utilized due to its greater conceptual validity.

5. Our study is based on the National Cohort of Aspiring Lawyers from the Class of 1961 who began law school in 1962. Out of these 1120 respondents, we were able to identify 776 practicing lawyers (62.2%) in the 1985 Martindale-Hubbell Directory. The listed lawyers were carefully matched with our national sample in terms of biographical information and educational affiliations. The 38% mortality in our sample are called "non-survivors." They comprise respondents who failed to persist in a legal career or who, while still practicing law, were not listed in the 1985 Directory. It is impossible to determine the nature of exits from our sample. Persumably, law school attrition, failure to persist in a legal career, death, and non-listing in the Directory twenty-four years after college graduation all contribute to sample mortality. For the profession as a whole, data on attrition from law school are available, but there is a lack of reliable empirical data on switching careers, retirements and deaths (Abel, 1989: 76, 257).

6. While our sample differs somewhat from those of other studies, differences in sample design and specification of variables make comparisons difficult. Erlanger's (1980) study of

private practitioners revealed that 23% of his sample was Jewish, 26% were Catholic and 51% were Protestant. One quarter of his sample had professional fathers and 16% graduated from "high" quality law schools. In Ladinsky's Detroit sample, 35% of solo practitioners were Jewish and 31% were Protestant. He found that 14% of solo practitioners and 73% of firm lawyers were graduated from "National" schools (1963b).

7. A sample mortality rate of 38% may be low for the quarter of a century between our initial contact with these respondents and the collection of data on their practices mid-career, the representativeness of the sample is uncertain. There was no way to determine the percentage of the non-survivors who were practicing law in 1984 but who were not listed in the Directory. While they differed significantly from survivors in social origins and academic achievement, we do not know how they differed in legal practices or if they were even practicing law. Compared to Curran's (1986) report, our sample has a lower percentage of solo practitioners and government lawyers and a higher percentage of firm and corporate lawyers, but comparable percentages of lawyers in the judiciary. Our sample is slightly more Jewish than Erlanger's (1980) sample. While these characteristics of the data are not unremarkable and do call for qualified generalizations, they are not debilitating limitations.

APPENDIX CORRELATION MATRIX OF SOCIAL ORIGINS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT, AND PRACTICE CHARACTERISTICS FOR A COHORT OF LAWYERS

VARIABLE NAME	Lawyer-Parent	Protestant	Catholic	Jewish	NW Europ. Cath	NW Europ. Prot	Irish Catholic	Academic Perf.	Law Sch. Qual.	City Size	Solo Practice	Firm Practice	Firm Size Corp Practice
A. SOCIAL ORIGINS													
Lawyer-Parent	1.000												
	(751)												
Religion													
Protestant	-.014	1.000											
	(688)	(703)											
Catholic	.023	-.523*	1.000										
	(688)	(703)	(703)										
Jewish	.006	-.498*	-.403*	1.000									
	(688)	(703)	(703)	(703)									
Ethnoreligious													
NW Europ. Cath.	.067	-.297*	.544*	-.227*	1.000								
	(657)	(671)	(671)	(671)	(671)								
NW Europ. Prot.	-.018	.873*	-.475*	-.467*	-.259*	1.000							
	(657)	(671)	(671)	(671)	(671)	(671)							
Irish Catholic	.068	-.273*	.525*	-.213*	-.094*	-.256*	1.000						
	(677)	(692)	(692)	(692)	(665)	(665)	(692)						
B. ACHIEVEMENT													
Acad. Performance	.110*	.061	-.193*	.103*	-.091*	.076*	.110*	1.000					
	(693)*	(697)	(697)*	(697)*	(665)*	(665)	(686)*	(711)*					
Law Sch. Quality	.131*	.025	-.173*	.120*	-.112*	.016	-.106*	.497*	1.000				
	(752)	(700)	(700)	(700)	(669)	(669)	(689)	(708)	(770)				
C. PRACTICE													
City Size	.041	-.114*	-.041	.168*	.008	-.100*	.050	.117*	.161*	1.000			
	(716)*	(668)*	(668)	(668)*	(636)	(636)*	(658)	(678)*	(731)*	(734)*			
Solo Practice	-.107*	-.114*	.021	.099*	-.019	-.172*	-.006	-.172*	-.151*	-.168*	1.000		
	(612)*	(575)	(575)	(575)	(548)	(548)	(564)	(585)*	(626)*	(618)*	(629)*		
Firm Practice	.220*	.041	-.047	.015	.002	.041	-.011	.173*	.169*	.110*	-.515*	1.000	
	(726)	(677)	(677)	(677)	(645)	(645)	(666)	(687)*	(741)	(731)*	(628)	(744)	
Firm Size	-.020	-.031	-.024	.055	-.088	-.030	.060	.243*	.128	.346*	.000	.078	1.00
	(257)*	(244)	(244)	(244)	(244)	(236)	(240)	(245)	(261)	(257)	(262)*	(261)*	(262)
Corporate Prac.	-.152*	.024	.047	-.080	.034	.052	-.017	.008	-.022	.058	-.287*	-.389*	.00
	(612)	(575)	(575)	(575)	(548)	(548)	(564)	(585)	(626)	(618)	(629)	(628)	(26)

* = Significant @ .05

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STD. DEV.	SUM
1. Lawyer-Parent	753	.201	.402	152
2. Protestant	711	1.09	.772	779
3. Catholic	703	.297	.457	209
4. Jewish	703	.277	.448	195
5. NW Europ. Catholic	611	.111	.315	75
6. NW Europ. Protestant	611	.347	.476	233
7. Irish Catholic	692	.104	.306	72
8. Academic Performance	711	1.096	.772	779
9. Law School Quality	770	.718	.836	553
10. City Size	734	1.861	.760	1366
11. Solo Practice	629	.275	.447	173
12. Firm Practice	744	.501	.500	373
13. Firm Size	262	1.943	.854	509
14. Corporate Practice	629	.178	.383	112

REFERENCES

ABBOTT, Andrew. 1988. **The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor.** Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

ABEL, Richard L. 1986. "The Transformation of the American Legal Profession," 20 **Law & Society Review** 7-17.

_____ and Philip S.C. Lewis, eds. 1988. **Lawyers In Society: The Common Law World.** Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

--------. 1989. **American Lawyers.** New York: Oxford University Press.

BLAU, Peter M. and R. M. MARGULIES. 1974/75. "The Reputations of American Professional Schools," **The Magazine of Higher Learning** 42-47.

CARLIN, Jerome L. 1962 **Lawyers on Their Own: A Study of Individual Practitioners in Chicago.** New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

CARTTER, The Report. 1977. "On the Leading Schools of Education, Law and Business," **Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning** 44-48.

CURRAN, Barbara A. 1985. **The 1984 Lawyer Statistical Report.** Chicago: American Bar Foundation.

_____. 1986. "American Lawyers in the 1980s: A Profession in Transition", 20 **Law & Society Review** 19-52.

DAVIS, James A. 1964. **Great Aspirations.** Chicago, Il: Aldine Publishing Co.

EPSTEIN, Cynthia F. 1981. **Women In Law.** New York: Basic

Books.

ERLANGER, Howard S. 1980. "The Allocation of Status Within Professions: The Case of the Legal Profession", 58 **Social Forces** 882-903.

FOUCAULT, Michel. 1970. **The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences**. New York: Vintage.

_____. 1978. **The History of Sexuality**. New York: Vintage.

FRIEDSON, Eliot. 1970. **Profession of Medicine: A Study of the Sociology of Applied Knowledge**. New York: Dodd, Mead.

_____. 1984. "The Changing Nature of Professional Control", **Annual Review of Sociology** 10:1-20.

_____. 1986. **Professional Powers: A Study of the Institutionalization of Formal Knowledge**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

GOODE, William. 1957. "Community Within a Community: The Professions: Psychology, sociology and medicine," 22 **American Sociological Review** 194-200.

HAGAN, John, Marie HUXTER, and Patricia PARKER. 1988. "Class Structure and Legal Practice: Inequality and Mobility Among Toronto Lawyers," 22 **Law & Society Review** 9-55.

HALLIDAY, Terence C. 1987. **Beyond Monopoly: Lawyers, State Crises, and Professional Empowerment**. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

HANDLER, Joel F. 1967. **The Lawyer and His Community**. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

HAUG, Marie B. 1975. "The Deprofessionalization of Everyone?" 3 **Sociological Focus** 197-213.

_____. 1976. "The Erosion of Professional Authority: A Cross-

Cultural Inquiry in the Case of the Physician," 54 **Health and Society/MMFQ** 83-106.

HEINZ, John P. and Edward O. LAUMANN. 1982. **Chicago Lawyers: The Social Structure of the Bar.** New York: Russell Sage; and Chicago: American Bar Foundation.

JOHNSON, Terence J. 1972. **Professions and Power.** London: Macmillan.

LADINSKY, Jack. 1963a. "Careers of Lawyers, Law Practice, and Legal Institutions," 28 **American Sociological Review** 47-54.

_____. 1963b. "The Impact of Social Backgrounds of Lawyers on Law Practice and the Law," 16 **Journal of Legal Education** 127-136.

_____. 1964. "The Social Profile of a Metropolitan Bar: A Statistical Survey in Detroit," 1964 **Michigan State Bar Journal** 12.

LANDON, Donald D. 1988. "Lasalle Street and Main Street: The Role of Context in Structuring Law Practice," 22 **Law & Society Review** 213-236.

------. 1990. **Country Lawyers.** New York: Praeger.

LARSON, Magali Sarfatti. 1977. **The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis.** Berkeley: University of California Press.

LAUMANN, Edward O. 1973. **Bonds of Pluralism: The Form and Substance of Urban Social Networks.** New York: Wiley.

LORTIE, Dan C. 1960. "Institutional and Entrepreneurial Careers in Law and Medicine," Unpublished. Presented at the Harvard University School of Education.

MEYHEW, Leon. 1968. "Ascription in Modern Society," 38 **Sociological Inquiry** 102.

NELSON, Robert L. 1988. **Partners with Power: Social Transformation of The Large Law Firm**. Berkeley, Ca: The University of California Press.

O'GORMAN, Hubert. 1963. **Lawyers and Matrimonial Cases: A Study of Informal Pressures In Private Practice**. New York: Columbia University Press.

PARSONS, Talcott. 1951. **Social Structure and Dynamic Processes: The Case of Modern Medical Practice in the Social System**. Glencoe, Ill: The Free Press.

ROSENTHAL, Douglas E. 1974. **Lawyer and Client: Who's in Charge?** New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

ROSS, H. Laurence. 1970. **Settled Out of Court: The Social Process of Insurance Claims Adjustment**. Chicago: Aldine.

SLOVAK, Jeffrey S. "Working for Corporate Actors: Social Change and Elite Attorneys in Chicago," 1979. **American Bar Foundation Research Journal** 465.

SMIGEL, Erwin O. 1969. **The Wall Street Lawyer: Professional Organization Man?** New York: New York University Press.

SOKOLOFF, Natalie J. 1988. "Evaluating Gains and Losses by Black and White Women and Men in the Professions, 1960-1980," 35 **Social Problems** 36.

STARR, Paul. 1982 **The Social Transformation of American Medicine: The Rise of a Sovereign Profession and the Making of a Vast Industry**. New York: Basic Books.

VAN ALSTYNE, Scott. 1982. "Ranking the law Schools: The Reality of Illusion?", 1982 **American Bar Foundation Research Journal** 649-684.

VOLLMER, Howard M. and Donald L. MILLS (eds). 1966. **Professionalization**. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

WARKOV, Seymour with Joseph ZELAN. 1965. **Lawyers in the Making**. Chicago: Aldine.

_____ and Sharyn L. ROACH. (unpublished paper) "Social and Academic Origins and Legal Careers: An Overview of Findings From a 24 Year Longitudinal Study."

WILENSKY, Harold L. and Anne T. LAURENCE. 1979. "Job Assignment in Modern Societies: A Re-examination of the Ascription-Achievement Hypothesis," in Amos Hawley, **Societal Growth: Processes and Implication**. New York: The Free Press.

WOOD, Arthur L. 1967. **Criminal Lawyer**. New Haven: College and University Press.

WOLINSKY, Frederic D. 1988. **The Sociology of Health: Principles Practitioners, and Issues**. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

ZEMANS, Frances K. and Victor G. ROSENBLUM. 1981. **The Making of A Public Profession**. Chicago: American Bar Foundation.